APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,708	04/30/2001	James R.H. Challenger	Y0R9-2001-0281US1 (8728-5	2686

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

46069   7590   03/01/2005

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 WOODBURY ROAD
WOODBURY, NY 11797

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/845,708	CHALLENGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 November 2004</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14,16-24 and 28-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14,16-24 and 28-31</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/04</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment, and IDS filed on 10/21/2004.

This action is made Final.

2.   In the amendment, claims 13-15, and 25-27 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-14, 16-24, and 28-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, 16, and 28 are independent

claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 1, 3-8, 13-15, and 28-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Troyansky et al, hereinafter Troyansky (US Pub.# 2003/0190054 A1,

10/9/2003, Provisional application filed on 10/3/2000), in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's

Web Workshop Creating Commercial Web Pages", hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996, pp.110-

115), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4.   The rejection of claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of "Using Netscape, The User-Friendly

Reference", Ernst, W., hereinafter Netscape, QUE, 1995, pp.324-327, has been withdrawn as

necessitated by the amendment.

5.   The rejection of claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Davis et al, hereinafter Davis (US PUB.#

20040037449, 2/26/2004, Provisional filed on 2/4/2000), has been withdrawn as necessitated by

the amendment.

6.   The rejections of claims 10-12, and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of "Adobe PageMill 2.0

Handbook", Lewis, R., hereinafter Pagemill, Hayden Books, 1996, pp.138-143, have been

withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

7.   The rejections of claims 16-20, and 22-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong (Pat.# 6,151,609,

11/21/2000), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

8.   The rejection of claim 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of Pagemill,

has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

9.   The rejections of claim 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of Minematsu

(Pat.# 6,700,993, 3/2/2004, filed on 9/6/2000), has been withdrawn as necessitated by the

amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

10.   The information disclosure statement filed 10/21/2004 has been considered.

Drawings

11.   The drawings filed on 4/30/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12.   Claims 25-27 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claims 1, 3-8, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Troyansky et al, hereinafter Troyansky (US Pub.# 2003/0190054 A1, 10/9/2003, Provisional

application filed on 10/3/2000), in view of Takashi et al, hereinafter Takashi (US Pub. #

2002/0059162, 5/16/2002, filed on 2/8/1999), and further in view of Lemay et al, "Laura

Lemay's Web Workshop Creating Commercial Web Pages", hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996,

pp.110-115).

Regarding independent claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into

digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--

watermarks--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files, which

are in a textual format-- *a static textual portion of the HTML document* (as is well known, and

shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), are obtained, and then watermarked by converting

those HTML parts into an image--*media file*. Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a*

server request for the HTML document; providing to the client a media file. However, Takashi

teaches clients accessing or requesting HTML web pages information from a server (0020, 0005,

0024, 2nd parag.). In other words, the web page is transmitted or sent to the requesting client.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine Troyanksy, and Takashi and place the image or media file into an HTML page using an

"<IMG SRC>" tag, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as

HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the

benefit of protecting the HTML document from unauthorized use over the Internet.

Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *a dynamic assembly image tag of the HTML*

document that references textual content. However, Lemay teaches inserting an image into a

web page, such as an album cover, using an "<IMG SRC>abbacov.gif..." tag--*a dynamic*

assembly image tag of the HTML document that references textual content-- which references an

image of the album cover using the title of the image (page 111, lines 21-32, page 112, lines 15-

22, and fig. 6.5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine Troyanksy, and Lemay and place the image or media file into an

HTML page using an "<IMG SRC>" tag, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of

documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003).

Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Moreover, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files, which are in a textual format (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), are obtained, and then watermarked by converting --*converting at the server the textual content referenced by the dynamic assembly image tag*-- those HTML parts into an image--*media file.*

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words the parts of the HTML files are watermarked by converting those HTML parts into an image.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *an expression of an idea within the textual content is the property of an entity* . However, Lemay teaches inserting an image into a web page, such as an album title—"ABBA: You Can Dance, You Can Cry"--, using an "<H1>" tag -- HTML entity (page 112, line 22, and fig. 6.5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, and Lemay and place the album title into an HTML page using an "<H1>" tag, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden

images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words the parts of the HTML files are

watermarked by converting those HTML parts into an image.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden

images--*watermarks*--such as image. The watermarks are used to enforce rights to digital media

to be distributed to an authorized party (0002-0003). In other words the parts of the HTML files

are watermarked by converting those HTML parts into an image--*media file*.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches compressing a

watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*compression preference* (0004, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches compressing a

watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*file format* (0004, lines 6-9).

Regarding independent claim 13, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into

digital content *–determining a content creation preference*--by replacing or converting parts of

digital files, such as HTML files—*electronically encoded document*-- with hidden images--

watermarks--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files are

extracted, and then watermarked by converting those HTML parts, which are in a textual format

(as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), into an image--*media file*.

Moreover, Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *obtaining the electronically encoded document*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to obtain the HTML file, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Furthermore, Troyansky teaches distributing digital content, such as the watermarked HTML files, to an authorized user—*content in image format to client* (0003).

Claims 28-30 are directed towards program instructions stored on a program storage device for executing the steps found in claims 1, 3, and 5 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

15.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, and further in view of Lemay, and further in view of "Using Netscape, The User-Friendly Reference", Ernst, W., hereinafter Netscape, QUE, 1995, pp.324-327.

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the media file is stored in one of a client-side database and a networked cache*. However, Netscape teaches the temporarily storing previously viewed web pages, in a browser's computer (page 325, lines 17-page326, line 14). It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky,

Lemay, and Netscape, because Netscape teaches above storing previously viewed web pages

locally in the computer's temporary directory or cache. Thus, providing the benefit of quickly

accessing the web pages, which also contain images.

16.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in

view of Takashi, further in view of Lemay, and further in view of Davis et al, hereinafter Davis

(US PUB.# 20040037449, 2/26/2004, Provisional filed on 2/4/2000).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as image files with hidden

images--*watermarks* (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the media file is sound file*.

However, Davis teaches embedding audio, such as synthesized text, watermarks into media

signals (0041). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to have combined Troyansky, Lemay, and Davis, because Troyansky teaches

enforcing digital rights of image documents, by inserting watermarked information into the

document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document

from unauthorized use using hidden audio files.

17.   Claims 10-12, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Troyansky, in view of Takashi, and further in view of Lemay, and further in view of "Adobe

PageMill 2.0 Handbook", Lewis, R., hereinafter Pagemill, Hayden Books, 1996, pp.138-143.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003).

Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *generating an image map corresponding to the image file,*

according to a mapping preference stored on the server. However, Takashi teaches clients

accessing or requesting HTML web pages information from a server (0020, 0005, 0024, 2nd

parag.)Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL, using a

"USEMAP" attribute—*mapping preference*--, into a web page (page 139, page 141, lines 24-34,

and fig. 6.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Troyansky, Takashi, Lemay, and Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches

enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into

the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting data in the HTML document

from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003).

Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the mapping preference relates selectable spatial display*

coordinates to external document identifiers in order to enable user navigation. However,

Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL. The image is

divided into areas, setup by coordinates along with their associated URLs. When a user clicks on

an area, the browser jumps to the URL—*external document identifier*-- of the respective area

(page 139, lines 21-33, and fig. 6.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Lemay, and Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting data in the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 12,which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *converting the textual content to a media file eliminates the use of scripting commands for presenting the textual content.* However, Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL. The image is divided into areas, setup by coordinates along with their associated URLs (page 139, lines 21-33, and fig. 6.1). This means, that the necessity of the need for using scripting commands to present textual content, since images are being used. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Lemay, and Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting data in the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Claim 31 is directed towards program instructions stored on a program storage device for executing the steps found in claim 10, and therefore is similarly rejected.

18. Claims 16-20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Troyansky, in view of Takashi, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong (Pat.#

6,151,609, 11/21/2000).

Regarding independent claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into

digital content –*determining a content creation preference*--by replacing or converting parts of

digital files, such as HTML files—*electronically encoded HTML document*-- with hidden

images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files

are extracted, and then watermarked by dynamically converting those HTML parts, which are in

a textual format (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), into an image.

Furthermore, Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a request for the content*

from a client; obtaining, at a server, the content in text format, automatically by the server.

However, Truong teaches an Internet server receiving an HTML file selection. In response, the

Internet server communicates the HTML file in textual format to a requesting client (col.8, lines

38-53). Takashi teaches clients accessing or requesting HTML web pages information from a

server (0020, 0005, 0024, 2nd parag.).It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to have combined Troyansky, Takashi, Lemay, and Truong,

because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting

watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting

the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML

files, which are in a textual format (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-

36), with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of

the HTML files are extracted, and then watermarked by dynamically converting those HTML

parts into an image.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as image files with hidden

images--*watermarks* (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a request for the*

content from a client; obtaining the content in text format. However, it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have retrieved the image file,

because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of image documents, by inserting

watermarked information into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting

the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches compressing a

watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*watermarking preference* (0004, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Troyansky teaches compressing a

watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*compression preference* (0004, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting or storing a digital watermark into digital content by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as image files with hidden images--*watermarks* (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *an HTML containing a reference to the stored content in the image format for retrieval and inline dynamic assembly by the client.* However, Truong teaches the using a web browser for interpreting HTML tags and displaying images identify by the tags—*dynamically assembling by the client browser of identified images*—(col.6, lines 55-67, col.7, lines 7-40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have retrieved the image file, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of image documents, by inserting watermarked information into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

19.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of Pagemill.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003).

Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the mapping preference relates selectable spatial display*

coordinates to external document identifiers in order to enable user navigation. However,

Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL. The image is

divided into areas, setup by coordinates along with their associated URLs. When a user clicks on

an area, the browser jumps to the URL—*external document identifier*-- of the respective area

(page 139, lines 21-33, and fig. 6.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Takashi, Lemay, Truong, and

Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by

inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of

protecting data in the HTML document from unauthorized use.

20.   Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in

view of Takashi, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of

Minematsu (Pat.# 6,700,993, 3/2/2004, filed on 9/6/2000).

        Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 19, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital

watermark into digital content by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML

files such as image (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a client system*

request for verification of the watermarked content. However, Minematsu teaches a user

terminal transmitting first transmission of watermarked information to a detection center, where

the information is authenticated. The information is then transmitted to the user terminal, where

the authentication result is displayed (col.3, lines 61-col.4, line 67). It would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Troyansky,

Lemay, and Minematsu, because Minematsu teaches providing a tamper resistant watermarked

image for encrypting information (col. 3, lines57-67). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting

the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Response to Arguments

21.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 10/21/2004 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants indicate that Troyansky fails to

teach "providing to the client a media file corresponding to a dynamic assembly image tag of the

HTML document, wherein the dynamic assembly image tag references textual content as

claimed in claims 1 and 28" (page 9, lines 4-7). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection

of these claims in light of the newly applied rejection above.

Moreover, The Applicants indicate that "Lemay does not teach or suggest providing to the

client a media file corresponding to a dynamic assembly image tag of the HTML document,

wherein the dynamic assembly image tag references textual content" (page 9, line 21-page 10,

line 2). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of these claims in light of the newly

applied rejection above.

Claims 3-8, 29-30 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly included

rejections above.

Moreover, The Applicants indicate that neither Troyansky, nor Lemay teach or suggest,

compressing the media file according to a compression preference stored on the server (page 10,

lines 13-23). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of these claims in light of the

newly applied rejection above.

Claims 2, 9-8, 10-12, 31 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly

included rejections above.

Claims 16-20, 22-23 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly included

rejections above.

Claims 17-20, 21-23 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly included

rejections above.

Conclusion

22.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

I.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least

one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

> Commissioner for Patents
> P.O. Box 1450
> Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306, (for all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

2/18/05